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All that we can read of Procles are two fragments provided by Pausanias in his *Periegesis* in the second century A.D. Pausanias calls him a Carthaginian from North Africa, but his name, Procles, and his father’s, Eucrates, are Greek. Pausanias does not state a title for Procles’ work. The first fragment comes in an ethnographical digression about the wild beasts of Libya, the second in a comparison between the Hellenistic kings Pyrrhus of Epirus and Alexander the Great (*FHG IV* 483–484, frr.1–2):

Not far from the building in the market-place of Argos is a mound of earth, in which they say lies the head of the Gorgon Medusa. I omit the miraculous, but give the rational parts of the story about her. After the death of her father, Phorcus, she reigned over those living around Lake Tritonis, going out hunting and leading the Libyans to battle. On one such occasion, when she was encamped with an army against the forces of Perseus, who was followed by picked troops from the Peloponnesus, she was assassinated by night. Perseus, admiring her beauty even in death, cut off her head and carried it to show the Greeks.

But Procles, the son of Eucrates, a Carthaginian, thought a different account more plausible than the preceding. It is as follows. Among the incredible monsters to be found in the Libyan desert are wild men and wild women. Procles affirmed that he had seen a man from them who had been brought to Rome. So he guessed that a woman wandered from among them, reached Lake Tritonis and harried the neighbours until Perseus killed her; Athena was supposed to have helped him in this exploit, be-
cause the people who live around Lake Tritonis are sacred to her.¹

Procles the Carthaginian indeed rated Alexander the son of Philip higher on account of his good fortune and for the brilliance of his achievements, but said that Pyrrhus was the better man in infantry and cavalry tactics and in the inventing of stratagems of war.² (transl. W. H. S. Jones)

Scholars who have discussed Procles have seen in him a Hellenistic historian of the third or second century B.C. The most detailed arguments for a third-century date appear in a Konrat Ziegler’s footnote in H. Schaefer’s RE article. He points out that there were Greek authors writing in Carthage at that time³ and Procles may have written his work in Greek because Carthage was strongly influenced by the western Greek col-

¹ Paus. 2.21.5–6: τοὶ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῶν Ἀργείων ὁ λικυδομήματος οἱ μακρὰν χῶμα γῆς ἐστίν ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ κέισθαι τὴν Μεδούση λέγουσι τῆς Γοργώνος κεφαλήν. ἄπώντος δὲ τοῦ μύθου, τάδε ἄλλα ἐστὶν ἐστὶν εἰρημένα Φόρκιοι μὲν θυγατέρα εἶναι, τελευτήσαντος δὲ οἱ τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλευῶν τῶν περὶ τὴν λίμνην τὴν Τριτωνίδα ὁκοντών καὶ ἐπὶ θήραν τε ἐξείναι καὶ ἐς τὰς μάχας ἱκεῖσθαι τοῖς Λίβυσι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἀντικαθημένην στρατοῦ πρὸς τὴν Περσέος δύναμιν—ἐπεσεῖς γὰρ καὶ τῷ Περσαίῳ λογίδας ἐκ Πελοποννήσου—δολοφονηθῆκεν νίκτωρ, καὶ τὸν Περσέα τὸ κάλλος ἔτι καὶ ἐπὶ νεκρῷ θαμαίζουσι, οὕτω τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτελοῦσθαι αὐτῆς, ἀγενοῦς ἐς ἐπίδειξιν. Καρχηδονίω χρῄζει τὴν Εὐκράτους ἐποίησες λόγος ὁ θὰ ἐφαίνετο εἰναι τοῦ πρωτέρου πταθείτερος, Λίβυς ἐς ἐρημός καὶ ἀλλὰ παρέχεται θήρα ἁκοισανσιν οἱ πιστὰ, καὶ ἄνδρες εὐναίθα άγρακοι καὶ ἀγριαί γίνονται γυναίκες. ἐλεγέ τὸ ὁ Προκλῆς ἑπί αὐτῶν ἄνδρας ἱδεῖν κοιμαθέντα εἰς Ἄυην. εἰκάζειν δὲ πλανήθοντας γυναίκα ἐκ τούτων καὶ ἁφικομένην ἐπὶ τὴν λίμνην τὴν Τριτωνίδα λυμαίνεσθαι τοῖς προσόικοις, εἰς ὁ Περσαῖς ἀπεκτείνων αὐτὴν. Αὐτὴν δὲ οἱ συνεπλαξάθαι δοκεῖν τοῦ ἐργοῦ, ὅτι οἱ περὶ τὴν λίμνην τὴν Τριτωνίδα ἀνθρωποὶ ταύτης εἰσὶν ἱεροί.

² Paus. 4.35.4: Προκλῆς δὲ ο Καρχηδόνιος τύχης μὲν χρηστῆς ἐνεκα καὶ διὰ λαμπρύστηρα ἐργα ἐνέμεν Αλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Φιλίππῳ πλεόν, τάξις δὲ ὑπάλλατα τέ καὶ ἀπικόν καὶ στρατηγήματα ἐπὶ ἄνδρας πολεμοὺς εὐφείριν Περσῶν ἐφαύξει ἁμείνονα γενέσθαι.

onies as early as the sixth century.  

Momigliano conceived of a Polybius-like career for Procles of Carthage in the second century B.C.: he "wandered between Greece and Rome," and addressed his works to his Roman public, writing not only from his eyewitness experience in Africa but also from the most appealing context of Rome, where he reported seeing an African wild man; his name was a sign of Hellenization rather than of Greek origin and his career would have been similar to that of the Carthaginian philosopher Clitomachus (originally named Hasdrubal) who came to Athens in 146 B.C., became head of the Platonic Academy in 129, and wrote books dedicated to prominent Romans.

This article will argue that Procles the Carthagian was not a Hellenistic historian, but a sophist contemporary with Pausanias, and an example of the great intermingling of nations in this epoch. The idea of Procles being from the second century A.D. is not completely new: K. Wernicke in 1884 suggested that he was a writer of the second century rather than Hellenistic, but he had little impact on subsequent scholars.

Wernicke’s main argument was that the military glory of Pyrrhus was a popular image for writers during the Roman

---


6 K. Wernicke, De Pausaniae periegetae studiis Herodoteis (Berlin 1884) 101–102.

7 Wernicke’s idea is cited only by H. Hitzig and H. Blümmer, Pausanias Graeciae Descriptio I (Leipzig 1896) 585 [ad 2.21.6]: “Wernicke dagegen ... glaubt ihn in der Beginn des zweiten nachchristlicher Jahrhunderts setze und aus I, 12, 2 schliessen zu dürfe, sein Buch habe den Titel ἔργων ἵππος-μνήματα getragen.”
Empire. Indeed, while the topics of the two fragments are common in many periods of Greek literature, they are especially popular in the surviving literature of the Roman period:

Fr.1, *Libya and its marvellous creatures*: The tradition of events and characters attributed to Libya began with Herodotus (4.145–195). But the scientific writings of Aristotle and his school had the most influence on poets, historians, and paradoxographers from the Hellenistic period onwards in the development of the popular idea of Libya as a land of natural rarities. This tradition evolved into the treatment of this topic in two surviving declamations of the imperial period, the *Libykos* of Dio Chrysostom and the *Dipsades* of Lucian.10

Fr.2, *σύνκροισις of Alexander with Pyrrhus*: Texts of Roman date emphasized the fortune of Alexander’s exploits and his fame, and Roman rule was represented as a continuation of his empire.11 Pyrrhus’ similarity to Alexander the Great was addressed by Roman-era authors writing about his fascinating personality.12

---


10 Dio Chrys. 5.5, Luc. *Dips. 1.1*. Lucian did not visit Libya ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐπέβην τῆς Λυβίης τὸ παράπαν εὖ ποιῶν, 6; he knew this literary tradition through a major author, Nicander of Colophon ταυτὶ οὐ μὰ Δία πρὸς Νικανδρὸν τὸν ποιητὴν φιλοτιμοῦμενος, 9.


12 Especially Plutarch (*Pyrrh. 8.2–3*, 11.4) but also Dionysus of Halicarnassus (*Ant.Rom.* 20.10), Diodorus (22.11–12), and Pausanias (1.13.2–3). The
widely read\textsuperscript{13} and his deeds were a commonplace in military and strategic works of the first and second centuries and in sophists’ writings like Lucian’s \textit{Hippias}, \textit{Pro lapsu}, and \textit{The Ignorant Book Collector}.\textsuperscript{14}

Wernicke identified these fragments as excerpts from a collection of \textit{Pacta et dicta memorabilia}.\textsuperscript{15} In his opinion, Pausanias, who in writing Book 1 seems to have done a fair bit of reading on Pyrrhus in historical synopses (mentioning the \textit{ἐργῶν ὑπομνήματα} in 1.12.2) such as Procles’\textsuperscript{16}, could excerpt them in a couple of spots where he thought that they were pertinent: in Argos and Mothone. But Wernicke was aware of the difficulties of including fr.1 in such a collection of sayings and deeds,\textsuperscript{17} and although the general trend of Pausanias’ times was towards condensations,\textsuperscript{18} Pausanias claims to make use of a good deal

\textsuperscript{13} FGrHist 229; cited by Plutarch (\textit{Pyrrh.} 21.9) and Dionysius (20.10). Cf. Lévêque, \textit{Pyrrhos} (Paris 1957) 52–66.

\textsuperscript{14} Val. Max. 1.1. ext. 1; 2.7.15b; 3.7.10a; 4.3.5b; 6b,14a; 5.1. ext. 3–4; 6.5.1d; 8.13.5; 9.1.4. Frontin. \textit{Strat.} 2.2.1; 2.3.21; 2.4.9; 2.4.13; 2.6.9–10; 3.6.3; 4.1.3; 4.1.14; 4.1.18; 4.4.2. Polyaen. 6.6; 8.49; 8.68. Shared elements in Plut. \textit{Pyrrh.} 34, Paus. 1.13.7, and Lucian \textit{Hipp.} 1 and \textit{Pro Laps.} 11. Parody of the \textit{imitatio Alexandri} in the case of Pyrrhus: Luc. \textit{Ind.} 21.

\textsuperscript{15} Wernicke connected Pyrrhus’ deeds described at 4.35.4 with the mention of \textit{ἐργῶν ὑπομνήματα} at 1.12.2, after the long digression on Pyrrhus’ life: \textit{De Pausaniae} 102; Hitzig and Blümmer, \textit{Pausaniae} 585. In citing Procles, Pausanias is described as using “tradizione scritte e probabilmente diffuse”: D. Musti, \textit{Pausania Guida della Grecia} (Rome 1982–2003) I 284.

\textsuperscript{16} Fuit sane rerum mirabilium narratio, quae certe Pyrhi historiam rettulit; quae autem de Medusa ex Procle scribit Pausanias, loco nescio quo historiae inserta erant: Wernicke, \textit{De Pausaniae} 102.

\textsuperscript{17} For example, Hieronymus of Cardia is one of these historians mentioned in the \textit{Periegesis} (1.9.8, 13.9), but he could have read an imperial epitome. See M. Segre, “Le fonte di Pausania per la storia dei Diadochi,” \textit{Historia} 2 (1929) 217–237; Musti, \textit{Pausania} I XXIX–XXX; F. Chamoux, “La méthode historique de Pausanias d’après le livre I de la \textit{Periégése},” in \textit{Pausanias Historien} (Geneva 1994) 45–69. Diodorus absorbed the works of
of Hellenistic source material:

But as to the history of Attalus and Ptolemy, it is more ancient in point of time, so that tradition no longer remains, and those who lived with these kings for the purpose of chronicling their deeds fell into neglect even before tradition failed.\(^\text{18}\)

This passage is in fact the introduction to one of Pausanias' several excursuses on Hellenistic kings and Hellenistic Greece.\(^\text{19}\)

So it is quite possible that a Hellenistic author named Procles could be among his sources, whether in original form or in an imperial epitome.

The position I urge, however, is that Pausanias is quoting an oral source rather than a written one. Pausanias is not the slave to his written sources that he was generally believed to be in the nineteenth century.\(^\text{20}\)

In fact, Pausanias' life and work, like those of his contemporaries, were developed in lengthy travels around Asia Minor, Egypt, and Italy.\(^\text{21}\)

In Greece, he referred to sacred and civic spaces as political and cultural centers.

\(^{18}\) Paus. 1.6.1: τὰ δὲ ἐς Ἀτταλον καὶ Πτολεμαῖον ἡλικίᾳ τε ἦν ἀρχαιότερα, ὡς μὴ μένειν ἐτὶ τὴν φήμην αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ συγγενέοι τοὺς βασιλεύσαν ἐπὶ συγγραφῆ τῶν ἑργῶν καὶ πρότερον ἐτὶ Ἱμελήθησαν.


\(^{20}\) Especially Wilamowitz and his followers (Kalman, Robert, Pasquali) considered Pausanias' work to be based on earlier writers without personal observation in Greece. See Chr. Habicht, Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece (Berkeley 1985) 165–175.

There, his interest in the Greek past was shared not only with the *exgetai* / guides of these centers, but also with sophists and merchants from everywhere (Sidon, Lycia, Ephesos, Byzantium, Egypt, etc.), and local informants, whose religious and literary ideas Pausanias ultimately included in his *Description of Greece*. He mentions his professional quarrel with a man from Sidon in Greece about Asclepius. He discusses the authenticity of archaic poems with the Aetolian Arriphon, “who now enjoys a reputation second to none among the Lycians.” One man from Byzantium told him a story about Pausanias the hero of Plataea, in connection with the local history of the informant’s native city (3.17.7). Finally, Cleon from Magnesia ad Sipylum is mentioned for his research about Tityos, a giant, and his burial place (10.4.6). These examples provide clear parallels for the sort of relationship that can be envisaged for Pausanias and Procles.

There is good reason to believe that Procles was one of these oral sources rather than an authority which Pausanias knew only from written works: all references that Pausanias makes to guides and local informants seem to be consistently in the imperfect tense: this tense was apparently never used of written

---

22 They showed remains (Paus. 1.41.2), and the ancient texts and archives collected by the temple (9.31.9). Like interpreters, they lectured referring to the ancient oracles and the history of the temple. Pausanias mentions the names of guides Aristarchus at Olympia (5.20.4), Lyceas of Argos (1.13.8), and Iophon of Knossos (1.34.3). On Pausanias and his guides see F. de Angelis, “Pausania e i periegeti. La guidistica antica sulla Grecia,” in E. Vaiani (ed.), *Dell’antiquaria e dei suoi metodi* (ASNP Ser. IV Quad. 2 [1998]) 1–14; C. P. Jones, “Pausanias and His Guides,” in S. E. Alcock et al. (eds.), *Pausanias. Travel and Memory in Roman Greece* (Oxford 2001) 33–39; M. Pretzler, “Turning Travel into Text. Pausanias at Work,” *G&R* 51/2 (2004) 199–216.


24 τὰ δὲ ἐφ’ ἑµῶν Λυκίων τὸς μᾶλστα ὁµιοίως δόκιµος (2.37.3).
sources, and all Procles’ thoughts and statements are referred to in the imperfect tense. He presented an account that seemed (ἕτερϱος λόγος ὁδὲ ἐφαίνετο) to Pausanias more reliable regarding Perseus and the Gorgon. He affirmed (ἐλεγε) that he had seen a wild man brought to Rome. He guessed (εἶκϰαζεν) that the Gorgon was also a wild woman. He rated (ἐνεµεν) Alexander as the best general but said (ἔφασκϰεν) that Pyrrhus’ exploits were not entirely negligible.

Although Pausanias had written sources that he preferred, including Homer, he frequently presents what they offer along side different information from local sources that in many cases were oral. This is so in our case: the first generally accepted version (presented in the present perfect, τάδε ἄλλα ἐς αὐτήν ἐστιν εἰρϱηµένα) is contrasted with Procles’ arguments, which are based on apparently personal experiences. Procles would have even enjoyed peddling the irony of a native African having to go to Rome to learn something about the mysteries of his own homeland.

In sum, what Pausanias is citing is not a written source at all but an oral informant. Other matters, however, like Procles’ personality in Carthage, the context where he and Pausanias met, and the character and purposes of Procles’ research are more difficult to assess, since we have only the two fragments. What follows may be more speculative, but it aims at giving plausible ideas about dates, places, and especially the cultural context for Procles’ work in the world of the Second Sophistic.

First, is it possible to identify Procles as a wealthy individual from the Greek elite of the second century A.D. in North Africa? In the first century B.C. Greek language and civilisation

25 Cf. Jones, Pausanias, especially 34 and nn.6 and 7 for the use in Pausanias of what he calls “imperfect of recollection” (ἐλεγεν, ἐφασκεν, ἐδείκϰνυον, etc.) in connection with singular or plural expounders.

26 By far the most quoted and highly recognized by Pausanias: 9.9.5. Homer and other Classical writers are referred in the present, aorist, or perfect tense; see Jones, Pausanias 34 n.6.

were present there thanks to the patronage of rulers like Juba II (52 B.C.–A.D. 23) of Mauretania, or Hiempsal II (38–60 B.C.) of Numidia and the visits of Rhodian traders. North Africa flourished in the first and second centuries A.D. and Roman Carthage, in contact with the Mediterranean East, attracted immigrants from Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt who worked in administration. Education was carried out in


32 In A.D. 212 Carthage was commemorated by Ephesos as τὴν λαμπροτάτην καὶ διασημοτάτην Κολωνίαν Ἰουλίαν Κονκορδίαν Καρθαγίναν: I. Ephesos 2053.

33 They are found as officers in the tabularium (librarius, notarius, tabellarius). Their role in commerce was not negligible. There also was a φιλόσοφος at Carthage: Τ. Φλούσοφος Μάξιμος Κρής Γορτύνιος (CIL VIII 12924). See Thieling, Hellenismus 17–21; J. M. Lassère, Ubique populus. Peuplement et mouvements de population dans l’Afrique romaine (Paris 1977) 397–411 (Africa Proconsularis), 430–431 (Carthage); M. Fantar, “Présence grecque en Tunisie avant la conquête arabo-islamique,” in Proceedings of the Sixth international Congress of Graeco-Oriental and African Studies (Graeco-Arabica 7–8 [Nicosia 2000]) 143–146.
Greek and Latin.\textsuperscript{34} In fact, the newly rich elite in Africa might pay the cost of schooling in the best Greek schools (Apuleius, for example, went to Athens to learn Greek),\textsuperscript{35} since production \textit{utraque lingua} was considered an accomplishment. Ἀσκλήπεια and Πύθια were celebrated in Carthage.\textsuperscript{36} An African inscription names a certain prosperous member of this elite, Aelius Procles, son of P. Aelius Menecratianus, but, unfortunately, he is unlikely to be Pausanias’ Procles.\textsuperscript{37}

A good possibility about the context of Pausanias and Procles’ encounter would be a discussion in Rome: Procles reports seeing an African wild man who had been brought there. It is true that one could also conceive a career for a Hellenistic historian born in Africa and brought to Rome as a prisoner after the Punic Wars. But we can also suppose that he was the typical sophist in Rome, the vital destination for the Greek\textsuperscript{38} and African\textsuperscript{39} urban elite. Pausanias went to Rome as well,\textsuperscript{40} and it has been suggested that he was present at the


\textsuperscript{37} Menecratianus was a centurion who may have come from Asia Minor or Egypt, but in Africa his sons and his daughter were well situated near the great families in Carthage. See Lassère, \textit{Ubique populus} 600–601. However, the prosperity of this family was under Septimius Severus, while Pausanias did not much outlive Marcus Aurelius.


\textsuperscript{40} Paus. 8.16.4 (mausolea), 8.46.4–5 (Forum Augusti and the Palatine), 5.12.6 (Forum Traiani, theatre, baths), 6.9.3 (Temple of Peace).
celebration of the anniversary of the foundation of Rome in A.D. 148. He seems to speak of the exotic marvels brought to Rome for that occasion in a tone which one could conceive for Procles too. Perhaps both Pausanias and Procles may have witnessed the same event at Rome in 148. In that case, they might even be viewed as enjoying learning about and discussing, with the same wit and curiosity, the wonders of the whole Empire on display in the Circus Maximus.

Finally, I would suggest that a possible frame for this discussion would be given by sophistic oratory. Procles could fit into this context, in which communities were represented by sophists in search of official recognition (privileges, immunities, citizenship, etc.) from the Roman government, but also trying to reinforce ethnic and cultural ties and engage the Greek elite via diplomacy. In fact, Greek myth was a common language among communities in dealing with current problems. The most remarkable setting for these discussions was the Panhellenion league, where candidates adduced their Greek identity by connection with an ethnic origin in Greece.

41 This suggestion is based on an inscription listing the animals brought to Rome that recalls the list of exotic animals mentioned by Pausanias: 5.12.3 (elephants), 8.17.4 (hares), 9.21.1 (seals), 9.21.2 (bisons). See D. Knoepfler, “Pausanias à Rome en l’an 148?” REG 112 (1999) 485–509.
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In such a context, it is interesting to note that Procles’ fragments refer to matters that can be related to Argos—the Greek city described in the text in which fr.1 is quoted—which in fact can be viewed as the link of Carthage with Greece. Fr.1 is the mythological account of Perseus in Carthage and the Gorgon, whose grave (as Pausanias says) was displayed in Argos’ agora. It is likely to be intended as proof of the Greek identity of Carthage through its connection with Argos. Perseus’ triumph over the Libyan queen might be interpreted as a triumph of the Greek race over the barbarians.45

In fr.2 it may also be possible to see a connection with Pyrrhus’ funeral monument mentioned by Pausanias, a memorial from the time when Pyrrhus attacked Argos in 278 B.C. For Pausanias describes how Pyrrhus, soon after he had taken his vessels to Sicily where he was defeated by the Carthaginians,46 was killed in battle while leading an army against Argos and was buried in the agora.47 Thus Pyrrhus of Epirus is another link between the old Greek city and its supposed overseas colony. The Gorgon and Pyrrhus would be declared enemies of the Greek identity of both cities.48

It can also be seen that Procles, in his argument, shared the predilection of other sophists of the time for the archaic and for local tradition: he appears to have in mind here his fellow countryman, the Carthaginian Hanno (sixth century B.C.), and his travels along the Atlantic coast of North Africa. In his account, displayed on a bilingual Greek-Punic inscription in Carthage, Hanno said that he found islands with a lagoon populated with hirsute and savage people (mostly women) whom interpreters called “gorillas.” Interestingly, Procles would have known Hanno’s report from later, corrupt accounts which were

45 Antiochus of Aegeae (Cilicia) use of the same argument in seeking for his homeland full membership in the Panhellenion, claiming a relationship with Argos. See Spawforth and Walker, JRS 76 (1986) 103.
46 Paus. 1.12.5; Lévéque, Pyrrhos 451–507.
47 Paus. 1.13.5–8; Lévéque, Pyrrhos 571–638.
48 However Pausanias (1.12.5) does not agree. In his opinion, Carthage was populated by non-Greek people, Phoenicians from Tyre by descent.
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closer to his time: some Roman authors (such as Pliny the Elder) also stated that these islands, called Gorgades (for Gorillas), were the former home of the Gorgons.\footnote{Plin. \textit{HN} 6.200: contra hoc quoque promunturium Gorgades insulae narratur, Gorgonum quondam domus, bidui navigazione distantes a continent, ut tradit Xenophon Lampsacenus. penetravit in eas Hanno Poenorum imperator prodidique hirta feminarum corpora, viros perniciate evasisse; duarum Gorgadum cutes argumenti et miraculi gratia in Iunonis templo posuit, spectatas usque ad Carthaginem captam; also Mela 3.99 and Isid. \textit{Et.} 14.6.9. See S. Bianchetti, \textit{Isole africane nella tradizione romana,} \textit{L’Africa Romana} 6 (1988) 235–247, at 244–245. The author argues for a reading \textit{ΓΟΡΓΑΔΑΣ} derived from \textit{ΓΟΡΙΛΛΑΣ}; see 244 n.33 for reference to the Procles fragment.}

Consequently, Procles’ work may be connected with the purposes of the sophistic \textit{λόγος ἐπιδεικτικός}\footnote{See Dio Chrysostom’s \textit{To Tarsu} (33.17–27, 58–64); Aelius Aristides’ \textit{Orations to Smyrna} (17.3–7, 21.3–5); Libanius’ \textit{Antiochikos} (11.42–131).} and the works of local historians in his time.\footnote{See e.g. O. Andrei, \textit{A. Claudius Charax di Pergamo. Interessi antiquari e antichità cittadine nell’età degli Antonini} (Bologna 1984).} They discussed places in terms of a mythical and historical past connecting them to Greek cities (such as Athens, Argos, etc.) and sought Greek historical and mythical figures among their ancestors. One can imagine this plausible scenario for the genesis of Procles’ material: a sophist’s research on the history of Carthage might well have considered Perseus as one of the heroes in the region, and he might have mentioned Pyrrhus as one of the city’s foes.

In conclusion, rather than a writer of Hellenistic history, it may be possible to identify Procles as a wealthy individual from the elite Greek culture of the second century \textit{A.D.} who took up the role of a sophist in Carthage, a city of revived prosperity in Roman times, and who met Pausanias in Rome. The way Pausanias refers to Procles, the son of Eucrates, suggests that Procles was in the habit of identifying himself with a traditional Greek patronymic showing his Greek roots. If Procles had related, discussed, and embellished the past of Carthage in an encounter with Pausanias in Rome, he would have emphasized the close ties between Carthage and Greece. He would also
have surely been interested in writing his version of local history, as others in his time had done so well for other cities, making references to archaic authorities such as Hanno the Carthaginian traveller.

The problem is that Procles is quoted only twice, when Pausanias is writing about Argos and Mothone. Probably Pausanias is quoting from memory of speech, since he uses the imperfect tense (used for oral sources) to refer to Procles. This scarcity leaves room for many interpretations, but we have considered a plausible context for Procles and Pausanias’ meeting: during an informal discussion of this material (whose written version Pausanias would probably not have seen) or during a lecture given when both were in Rome in Antoninus Pius’ reign, Procles would have summed up the shared mythical and historical past with Argos in Greece as proof of Carthage’s prestige.\(^{52}\)

\(^{52}\) This article was written during different periods as Visiting Fellow at the Fondation Hardt and at the Department of the Classics of Harvard University. I would like to thank Prof. Jones, Prof. Petrucione, Prof. Konstan, and Elizabeth Kline, Matthias Lang, Carlos Molina, Monica Anne Walker, and Robert Cioffi (among others), for their helpful comments and encouragement.

\(\text{Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 50 (2010) 119–132}\)